arXiv:1211.6547v1 [math.MG] 28 Nov 2012

METRIC REGULARITY FOR OPTIMAL TRANSPORT PLANS

FABIO CAVALLETTI AND MARTIN HUESMANN

Abstract. Let (X,d,m) be a non-branching metric measure space. Assuming a metric Brenier's Theorem and self-intersection of evolving sets, we show a metric regularity result for optimal transport plans which could also be seen as a Lipschitz shortening Lemma. For instance our results apply to spaces satisfying $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$, both for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N = \infty$.

1. Introduction

In the last 20 years the theory of optimal transport has developed in a wide and fascinating field with a huge variety of applications in different fields inside and outside of mathematics. One reason for this is the rich interplay of the structure of optimal transport plans with the underlying geometry. For instance, Mather's shortening Lemma on a Riemannian manifold can be used to prove local Lipschitz regularity of transport maps at intermediate times which in turn can be used to prove that starting from an absolutely continuous measure geodesics in the L^2-Wasserstein space remain absolutely continuous for $t < 1$ (see Chapter 8 of [10] and references therein). In particular, this is a very nice example that regularity of transport plans is an extremely powerful tool. Recently, there have been huge advances for the regularity of the optimal transport maps on $\mathbb{R}^d$, e.g. see De Philippis and Figalli [6] and references therein.

In [2, 3] Ambrosio, Gigli and Savaré developed a calculus on metric measure spaces leading (among many other things) to a metric Brenier's Theorem (Theorem 10.3 in [2] or Assumption 1). In this short note we show Lipschitz regularity of the length of geodesics used by optimal transport plans in this metric setting under a mild additional assumption verified by $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$ spaces, with $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \infty$.

Our result can also be seen as a Lipschitz shortening lemma in the spirit of Theorem 8.22 of [10]. Not using any comparison geometry in the sense of Alexandrov, the best result known until now was Hölder-1/2 regularity, see Theorem 8.22 of [10].

This result will be used as a starting point in [4], where the structure of Wasserstein geodesics of $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$ spaces is studied. In the forthcoming paper [5], we use it to prove under $\mathsf{MCP}(K,N)$ the existence of transport maps for cost functions which are strictly convex functions of the distance.

We start by describing the setting and the result in more detail.

1.1. **Setting and main result.** The following notations and definitions will be fixed throughout this note. Let (X,d,m) be a non-branching metric measure space. $\mathcal{P}(Y)$ denotes the set of probability measures over the set Y and $\mathcal{P}_2(Z)$ denotes the set of probability measures with finite second moment over the the metric space (Z,ρ). The L^2-Wasserstein distance will be denoted by d_W.

We fix $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$. By classical optimal transport theory (e.g. Thm 5.10 in [10]), there exists a d^2-concave function φ such that the couple (φ, φ^d) is a couple of optimal Kantorovich potentials, namely any transference plan $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X)$ is optimal if and only if it gives measure one to the set

$$\Gamma := \{(x,y) \in X \times X : \varphi(x) + \varphi^d(y) = \frac{1}{2} d^2(x,y)\}.$$

We also fix a dynamical optimal transference plan $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}(X))$, i.e. if e_t is the evaluation map at $t \in [0,1]$, $e_t(\gamma) := \gamma_t$, then $\{(e_t)_\sharp \boldsymbol{\gamma}\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a geodesic in the L^2-Wasserstein space connecting μ_0 and μ_1 with $(e_0,e_1)_\sharp \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ being an optimal transference plan. The existence is ensured by Thm 7.21 in [10]. Let $G \subset \mathcal{G}(M)$ be the support of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, so $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(G) = 1$. Without loss of generality, we can assume G to be compact (using inner regularity of the Radon measure $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$).

MH gratefully acknowledges funding by SFB 611.

We will write $\mu_t = (e_t)_\sharp \gamma$ and for a geodesic γ we set $L(\gamma) = d(\gamma_0, \gamma_1)$. Fix $t \in (0,1)$. From the non-branching property of the space together with the d^2-monotonicity, the map

$$e_t(G) \ni x \mapsto e_t^{-1}(x) \in G$$

assigning to each point x of $e_t(G)$ the unique optimal geodesic passing through x at time t, is well defined. We will assume that a.e. geodesic stays in $e_t(G)$ for a positive amount of time (see Assumption 2). The main result of this note is

Theorem 1.1. *Provided a metric Brenier's Theorem (see* (2.2)*) and Assumption 2 hold the length map*

$$e_t(G) \ni x \mapsto L(e_t^{-1}(x)) \in (0, \infty)$$

has local Lipschitz constant bounded by $C/t(1-t)^2$*, where* C *depends only on the length* $L_t(\gamma_t)$ *and it is uniform if* $L(\gamma)$ *is uniformly bounded.*

Recall that for a map $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ the *local Lipschitz constant* is defined by

$$\limsup_{y \to x} \frac{|f(y) - f(x)|}{d(y,x)}.$$

Our results only gives estimates on the local Lipschitz constant as the set $e_t(G)$ does not need to be a length space.

It is worth noticing that, as proved in Proposition 2.5, Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 hold in $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$ and in $\mathsf{CD}(K,\infty)$ spaces. For a definition of these spaces we refer to [8, 9] or [10].

We start by recalling some facts about the time evolution of Kantorovich potentials and setting the framework of this note. The proof of the main theorem is done in three steps. First we decompose the space into evolving level sets of the Kantorovich potential of "codimension" one which are nearly "orthogonal" to the geodesics used by the optimal transport plan. Then we prove the Lipschitz result on these level sets and on the geodesics separately. Finally, we will put these estimates together to get the desired result. The main idea in the proofs is a combination of $d-$ and d^2-monotonicity.

2. Framework

Since we will consider Kantorovich potentials also for optimal transport between μ_0 and μ_t, and between μ_t and μ_1, we recall some results about their evolution in time. What follows is contained in [2].

Definition 2.1. Let $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$. Its *$d^2$-transform* $\varphi^d : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ is defined by

$$\varphi^d(y) := \inf_{x \in X} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} d^2(x,y) - \varphi(x) \right\}.$$

Accordingly $\varphi : X \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is *d^2-concave* if there exists $v : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ such that $\varphi = v^d$.

A *d^2-concave* function φ such that (φ, φ^d) is a maximizing pair for the dual Kantorovich problem between μ_0, μ_1 is called a *d^2-concave Kantorovich potential* for the couple (μ_0, μ_1). A function φ is called a *d^2-convex Kantorovich potential* if $-\varphi$ is a d^2-concave Kantorovich potential.

The d^2-convex potentials evolve according to the Hopf-Lax evolution semigroup H_t^s via the following formula:

$$H_t^s(\psi)(x) := \begin{cases} \inf\limits_{y \in X} \dfrac{1}{2}\dfrac{d^2(x,y)}{s-t} + \psi(y), & \text{if } t < s, \\ \psi(x), & \text{if } t = s, \\ \sup\limits_{y \in X} \psi(y) - \dfrac{1}{2}\dfrac{d^2(x,y)}{t-s}, & \text{if } t > s. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

We also introduce the rescaled cost $c^{t,s}$ defined by

$$c^{t,s}(x,y) := \frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2(x,y)}{s-t}, \qquad \forall t < s,\ x, y \in X.$$

Observe that for $t < r < s$

$$c^{t,r}(x,y) + c^{r,s}(y,z) \geq c^{t,s}(x,z), \qquad \forall x, y, z \in X,$$

and equality holds if and only if there is a constant speed geodesic $\gamma : [t, s] \to X$ such that $x = \gamma_t$, $y = \gamma_r$ and $z = \gamma_s$. The following result is taken from [10] (Theorem 7.36) but here we report a slightly different version.

Theorem 2.2 ([1], Theorem 2.18)**.** *Let $(\mu_t) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ be a constant speed geodesic in $(\mathcal{P}_2(X, d), d_W)$ and ψ a $c^{0,1}$-convex Kantorovich potential for the couple (μ_0, μ_1). Then $\psi_s := H_0^s(\psi)$ is a $c^{t,s}$-concave Kantorovich potential for (μ_s, μ_t), for any $t < s$.*

Similarly, if ϕ is a $c^{0,1}$-concave Kantorovich potential for (μ_1, μ_0), then $H_1^t(\phi)$ is a $c^{t,s}$-convex Kantorovich potential for (μ_t, μ_s), for any $t < s$.

This implies the following

Corollary 2.3. *Let φ be a d^2-concave Kantorovich potential for (μ_0, μ_1). Let $\varphi_t := -H_1^t(\varphi^d)$ be the $c^{t,1}$-concave Kantorovich potential for (μ_t, μ_1) and analogously let $\varphi_t^d := H_0^t(-\varphi)$ the $c^{0,t}$-concave Kantorovich potential for (μ_t, μ_0). Then:*

$$\varphi_t(\gamma_t) = \varphi(\gamma_0) - \frac{t}{2} d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_1), \qquad \varphi_t^d(\gamma_t) = \varphi^d(\gamma_1) - \frac{1-t}{2} d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_1), \qquad \boldsymbol{\gamma} - a.e.\ \gamma.$$

Proof. Since the proofs of the statements for φ_t and for φ_t^d are the same, we prefer to present only the one for φ_t.

Since

$$\varphi_t(x) = -H_1^t(\varphi^d)(x) = \inf_{y \in X} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2(x, y)}{1-t} - \varphi^d(y).$$

for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$-a.e. γ

$$\varphi_t(\gamma_t) \le \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2(\gamma_t, \gamma_1)}{1-t} + \varphi(\gamma_0) - \frac{1}{2} d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_1) = \varphi(\gamma_0) - \frac{t}{2} d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_1).$$

To prove the opposite inequality: observe that

$$\frac{d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_t)}{t} + \frac{d^2(\gamma_t, y)}{1-t} \ge d^2(\gamma_0, y),$$

therefore for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$-a.e. γ

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2(\gamma_t, y)}{1-t} - \varphi^d(y) \ge \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2(\gamma_t, y)}{1-t} - \frac{1}{2} d^2(\gamma_0, y) + \varphi(\gamma_0) \ge \varphi(\gamma_0) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_t)}{t} = \varphi(\gamma_0) - \frac{t}{2} d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_1).$$

Taking the infimum the claim follows. □

Also related to slopes of Kantorovich potentials is the following construction taken from [2]. Let $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz function and consider the following maps

$$D^+(x, t) := \max \left\{ d(x, y) : y \in \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ y \mapsto f(y) + \frac{d^2(x, y)}{2t} \right\} \right\},$$
$$D^-(x, t) := \min \left\{ d(x, y) : y \in \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ y \mapsto f(y) + \frac{d^2(x, y)}{2t} \right\} \right\}.$$

We will use these maps with $f = -\varphi^d$ and $f = -\varphi$ in the proof of Proposition 3.4. Then a monotonicity result holds true.

Lemma 2.4 ([2], Proposition 3.1)**.** *For all $x \in X$ it holds,*

$$D^+(x, t) \le D^-(x, s), \qquad 0 \le t < s.$$

As a consequence, $D^+(x, \cdot)$ and $D^-(x, \cdot)$ are both nondecreasing, and they coincide with at most countably many exceptions in $[0, \infty)$.

The assumptions that we will make throughout the paper are the following.

Assumption 1 (Metric Brenier's Theorem)**.** For every $t \in [0, 1)$:

$$\lim_{s \to 0} \frac{\varphi_t(\gamma_t) - \varphi_t(\gamma_{t+s})}{d(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t+s})} = d(\gamma_0, \gamma_1), \tag{2.2}$$

in $L^2(X, (e_t)_\sharp \boldsymbol{\gamma})$.

Assumption 2. For every $t \in (0,1)$, for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$-a.e. $\gamma \in G$ the point t is a point of Lebesgue density 1 for the set $I_t(\gamma) := \{\tau \in (0,1) : \gamma_\tau \in e_t(G)\}$. Namely for every $t \in (0,1)$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\mathcal{L}^1\big(I_t(\gamma) \cap (t-\varepsilon, t+\varepsilon)\big)}{\varepsilon} = 1, \qquad \text{for } \boldsymbol{\gamma} - a.e.\, \gamma \in G.$$

Regarding Assumption 1, by Hopf-Lax theory on (extended) non-branching metric measure spaces, the next inequality is true without any assumption:

$$\limsup_{y \to \gamma_t} \frac{|\varphi_t(y) - \varphi_t(\gamma_t)|}{d(y,\gamma_t)} \le d(\gamma_0,\gamma_1), \tag{2.3}$$

see Proposition 3.4 in [2] for the statement in the Hamilton-Jacobi framework or Proposition 3.9 in [2] for the Kantorovich potentials one.

Proposition 2.5. *Let (X,d,m) be a non-branching metric measure space verifying $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$, for $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. If $N = \infty$ and $\mu_0, \mu_1 \ll m$ both with finite entropy, then for any dynamical optimal transference plan $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 hold. If $N < \infty$ and $\mu_0 \ll m$, then for any $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_2(X,d,m)$ and any dynamical optimal transference plan $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 hold.*

Proof. Step 1. The metric Brenier's Theorem is proved in [2], Theorem 10.3, for extended metric spaces provided a uniform upper bound on the densities of μ_t with respect to m holds. Since in both frameworks such a property holds (due to non-branching of geodesics in the Wasserstein space and convexity of the entropy functionals, see also beginning of section 10 in [2]), Assumption 1 holds.

Step 2. Assume by contradiction Assumption 2 doesn't hold. Therefore there exists a set $H \subset G$, with $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(H) > 0$ so that for all $\gamma \in H$ the point t is a point of positive density for $I_t(\gamma)^c$, where the complement is taken in $(0,1)$. Possibly taking a subset of H, still of positive $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ measure, t is a point of density greater than α for $I_t(\gamma)^c$ for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$-a.e. $\gamma \in H$ and some $\alpha > 0$.

Let

$$E := \{(\gamma,s) \in H \times (0,1) : t+s \in I_t(\gamma)^c\} = \{(\gamma,s) \in H \times (0,1) : d(\gamma_{t+s}, e_t(G)) > 0\}.$$

Then by Fubini's Theorem

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma} \otimes \mathcal{L}^1(E) = \int_{(0,1)} \mathcal{L}^1(E(\gamma))\boldsymbol{\gamma}(d\gamma), \qquad E(\gamma) := P_2\Big(E \cap \big(\{\gamma\} \times (0,1)\big)\Big),$$

where P_i denotes the projection map on the i-th component, for $i = 1,2$. By the density property, for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$-a.e. $\gamma \in H$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\mathcal{L}^1(E(\gamma) \cap (t-\varepsilon,t+\varepsilon))}{\varepsilon} \ge \alpha,$$

then it follows that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \otimes \mathcal{L}^1\Big(E \cap \big(H \times (t-\varepsilon,t+\varepsilon)\big)\Big)}{\varepsilon} \ge \alpha \boldsymbol{\gamma}(H),$$

and again by Fubini's Theorem

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{(t-\varepsilon,t+\varepsilon)} \boldsymbol{\gamma}(E(\tau))\mathcal{L}^1(ds) \ge \alpha \boldsymbol{\gamma}(H), \qquad E(\tau) := P_1\Big(E \cap \big(H \times \{\tau\}\big)\Big).$$

So there must be a sequence of $\{s_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converging to 0 so that $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(E(t+s_n)) \ge C$, for some $C > 0$. Then, since $e_{t+s_n}(G)$ converges to $e_t(G)$ in Hausdorff topology as s_n goes to 0, we have

$$m(e_t(G)^\varepsilon) \ge m(e_t(G) \cup e_{t+s_n}(E(t+s_n))) \ge m(e_t(G)) + m(e_{t+s_n}(E(t+s_n))),$$

where $e_t(G)^\varepsilon := \{z \in X : d(z,e_t(G)) \le \varepsilon\}$. Since $\varrho_t \le M$ (from $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$ or $\mathsf{CD}(K,\infty)$, provided both μ_0 and μ_1 are absolute continuous with respect to m) on $e_t(G)$ for all $t \in (0,1)$, it follows that $m(e_{t+s_n}(E(t+s_n)))$ remains uniformly strictly positive as s_n goes to 0. Since

$$m(e_t(G)) \ge \limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} m(e_t(G)^\varepsilon),$$

we have a contradiction and the claim follows. □

Remark 2.6. As the last proof shows Assumptions 1 and 2 are also satisfied if we replace in Proposition 2.5 the $\mathsf{CD}(K,N)$ condition by the slightly weaker measure contraction property $\mathsf{MCP}(K,N)$ (for a definition see [9] and [7]).

3. Split Regularity

Fix $t \in (0,1)$. In the first part of this section we prove the regularity property of the length map $L\circ e_t^{-1}$ restricted to two families of "orthogonal" sets. In order to have a shorter notation we set $L_t = L \circ e_t^{-1}$.

Consider the following sets depending on $a \in \mathbb{R}$

$$K_a := \{\gamma_t : \varphi(\gamma_0) = a\}, \qquad K_a^d := \{\gamma_t : \varphi^d(\gamma_1) = a\} \tag{3.1}$$

Proposition 3.1. *For every $a \in \varphi(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_0))$, the map L_t restricted to K_a is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant equal to 1. The same holds replacing K_a with K_a^d and $a \in \varphi(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_0))$ with $a \in \varphi^d(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_1))$.*

Proof. Fix $a \in \varphi(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_0))$ and denote with G_a the set of geodesics in G leaving from $\varphi^{-1}(a)$, $G_a := G \cap e_0^{-1}(\varphi^{-1}(a))$. Then for any $\gamma \in G_a$ and any $z \in e_0(G_a)$

$$\frac{d^2(\gamma_0,\gamma_t)}{2t} = \varphi(\gamma_0) + \varphi_t^d(\gamma_t) = \varphi(z) + \varphi_t^d(\gamma_t) \le \frac{d^2(z,\gamma_t)}{2t}.$$

Hence for any $x \in K_a$,

$$L_t(x) = \min\big\{d(z,x) : z \in e_0(G_a)\big\},$$

therefore the length map L_t restricted to K_a is 1-Lipschitz. The proof for L_t restricted to K_a^d works the same. ☐

Remark 3.2. Note that the previous proposition also holds for $t = 0$.

With the same reasoning we obtain the following property.

Proposition 3.3. *For every $a \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $\Gamma_a := \{(\gamma_0,\gamma_1) : \gamma \in G, \varphi(\gamma_0) = a\}$ is d-cyclically monotone.*

Proof. Let $(x_i,y_i) \in \Gamma_a$ for $i = 1,\dots,n$ and observe that

$$\frac{1}{2}d^2(x_i,y_i) = \varphi(x_i) + \varphi^d(y_i) = \varphi(x_{i-1}) + \varphi^d(y_i) \le \frac{1}{2}d^2(x_{i-1},y_i).$$

Hence $d(x_i,y_i) \le d(x_{i-1},y_i)$ and therefore

$$\sum_{i=1}^n d(x_i,y_i) \le \sum_{i=1}^n d(x_i,y_{i+1}),$$

and the claim follows. ☐

We now prove regularity of L_t in a direction transversal to K_a. Recall that $I_t(\gamma) := \{\tau \in [0,1] : \gamma_\tau \in e_t(G)\}$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\gamma \in G$ be any optimal geodesic satisfying Assumption 2. Then for every $t \in (0,1)$ and $s^-, s^+ > 0$ it holds that*

$$\frac{1-t-s^+}{1-t} \le \frac{L_t(\gamma_{t+s^+})}{L_t(\gamma_t)} \le \frac{t+s^+}{t}, \quad \textit{for } t+s^+ \in I_t(\gamma),$$

$$\frac{t-s^-}{t} \le \frac{L_t(\gamma_{t-s^-})}{L_t(\gamma_t)} \le \frac{1-t+s^-}{1-t}, \quad \textit{for } t-s^- \in I_t(\gamma).$$

Proof. Step 1. First consider the case $t+s^+$, so fix $t \in (0,1)$ and take s^+ such that $t+s^+ < 1$. For ease of notation we just write $s^+ = s$. Note that

$$L_t(\gamma_{t+s}) = \frac{1}{1-t}d(\gamma_{t+s},\gamma_1^s),$$

where $\gamma^s = e_t^{-1}(\gamma_{t+s})$ and

$$d(\gamma_{t+s},\gamma_1^s) = D(\gamma_{t+s},1-t),$$

where $D(x,t) = d(x,y)$ for $y \in \mathrm{argmin}\{y \mapsto -\varphi^d(y) + \frac{d^2(x,y)}{2t}\}$. The non-branching property of (X,d,m) implies that D is a well defined map. From Lemma 2.4, $D(x,\cdot)$ is nondecreasing, therefore

$$D(\gamma_{t+s},1-t) \ge D(\gamma_{t+s},1-(t+s)) = d(\gamma_{t+s},\gamma_1) = (1-(t+s))d(\gamma_0,\gamma_1).$$

Hence

$$L_t(\gamma_{t+s}) = \frac{1}{1-t} D(\gamma_{t+s}, 1-t) \geq \frac{1-(t+s)}{1-t} L_t(\gamma_t).$$

Step 2. Reasoning as before, we get the same inequality for $t - s^- > 0$. We write again $s^- = s$. Indeed since $L_t(\gamma_t) = D(\gamma_{t-s}, 1-t+s)$, from the monotonicity property of $D(x, \cdot)$ we have

$$L_t(\gamma_{t-s}) = \frac{1}{1-t} D(\gamma_{t-s}, 1-t) \leq \frac{1}{1-t} D(\gamma_{t-s}, 1-(t-s)) = \frac{1}{1-t} d(\gamma_{t-s}, \gamma_1) = \frac{1-(t-s)}{1-t} L_t(\gamma_t).$$

To prove the remaining inequalities, just exchange the role of 0 and 1, i.e. use $\tilde{D}(x, s) = d(x, y)$ for $y \in \operatorname{argmin}\{y \mapsto -\varphi(y) + \frac{d^2(x,y)}{2s}\}$ together with the identity $(1-t)D(x, t) = t\tilde{D}(x, 1-t)$ for $t \in (0, 1)$. □

4. General regularity

For $t \in [0, 1)$, consider the following real valued map defined for $x \in e_t(G)$:

$$\Phi_t(x) := \varphi_t(x) + \frac{t}{2} L_t^2(x).$$

Recall that by Assumption 2 for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ almost every γ for $s \in I_t(\gamma)$ the map $L_t(\gamma_{t+s})$ is well defined. Hence, also the map $\Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s})$ is well defined for $s \in I_t(\gamma)$. Due to d^2-cyclical monotonicity, an equivalent definition is $\Phi_t(\gamma_t) := \varphi_0(\gamma_0)$ (see also Corollary 2.3).

Throughout this section $t \in (0, 1)$ is fixed.

Lemma 4.1. *The map Φ_t is continuous.*

Proof. For $t = 0$, $\Phi_0 = \varphi$ and there is nothing to prove. So assume $t \in (0, 1)$. It is sufficient to prove that $e_t^{-1} : e_t(G) \to G$ is a continuous map. Note that e_t^{-1} is well defined again by d^2-cyclical monotonicity. So let $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset e_t(G)$ be a sequence converging to $x \in e_t(G)$ as $n \nearrow \infty$. If $\gamma^n = e_t^{-1}(x_n)$, then by compactness of G, there exists a subsequence $\{n_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that γ^{n_k} will converge to $\hat{\gamma} \in G$. Since $\gamma_t^n = x_n$, necessarily $\hat{\gamma}_t = x$. By d^2-cyclical monotonicity, there is only one possible geodesic $\gamma \in G$ such that $\gamma_t = x$, hence the whole sequence $\{\gamma^n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is converging to $e_t^{-1}(x)$. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\gamma \in G$ be fixed so that Assumption 2 holds. Then*

$$\Phi_t(\gamma_{t-s}) > \Phi_t(\gamma_t) > \Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s}),$$

provided $t - s \in I_t(\gamma)$ for the first inequality, and $t + s \in I_t(\gamma)$ for the second one.

Proof. Step 1. We first prove the first inequality. Suppose by contradiction the existence of $s \in (0, 1)$ such that $t - s \in I_t(\gamma)$ and $\Phi_t(\gamma_{t-s}) \leq \Phi_t(\gamma_t)$. From Proposition 3.3, necessarily $\Phi_t(\gamma_{t-s}) < \Phi_t(\gamma_t)$. So let $\hat{\gamma} := e_t^{-1}(\gamma_{t-s})$, then the previous inequality reads as

$$\varphi(\hat{\gamma}_0) < \varphi(\gamma_0).$$

So we can deduce

$$\frac{1}{2t} d^2(\hat{\gamma}_0, \gamma_{t-s}) = \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_0) + \varphi_t^d(\gamma_{t-s}) < \varphi(\gamma_0) + \varphi_t^d(\gamma_{t-s}) \leq \frac{1}{2t} d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_{t-s}),$$

and therefore $d(\hat{\gamma}_0, \gamma_{t-s}) < d(\gamma_0, \gamma_{t-s})$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_{t-s}) + d^2(\hat{\gamma}_0, \gamma_t) &\leq d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_{t-s}) + \big(d(\hat{\gamma}_0, \gamma_{t-s}) + d(\gamma_{t-s}, \gamma_t)\big)^2 \\ &= d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_{t-s}) + d^2(\hat{\gamma}_0, \gamma_{t-s}) + d^2(\gamma_{t-s}, \gamma_t) + 2d(\hat{\gamma}_0, \gamma_{t-s})d(\gamma_{t-s}, \gamma_t) \\ &< d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_{t-s}) + d^2(\hat{\gamma}_0, \gamma_{t-s}) + d^2(\gamma_{t-s}, \gamma_t) + 2d(\gamma_0, \gamma_{t-s})d(\gamma_{t-s}, \gamma_t) \\ &= d^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_t) + d^2(\hat{\gamma}_0, \gamma_{t-s}), \end{aligned}$$

and since $\hat{\gamma}_t = \gamma_{t-s}$ and $\hat{\gamma} \in G$, this is in contradiction with d^2-cyclical monotonicity.

Step 2. We now prove the other inequality. Suppose by contradiction the existence of $s \in (0, 1)$ such that $t + s \in I_t(\gamma)$ and $\Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s}) \geq \Phi_t(\gamma_t)$. From Proposition 3.3, necessarily $\Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s}) > \Phi_t(\gamma_t)$. So let $\hat{\gamma} := e_t^{-1}(\gamma_{t+s})$, then the previous inequality reads as

$$\varphi(\gamma_0) < \varphi(\hat{\gamma}_0).$$

So we can deduce

$$\frac{1}{2(t+s)}d^2(\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}) = \varphi(\gamma_0) + \varphi^d_{t+s}(\gamma_{t+s}) < \varphi(\hat\gamma_0) + \varphi^d_{t+s}(\gamma_{t+s}) \le \frac{1}{2(t+s)}d^2(\hat\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}),$$

and therefore $d(\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}) \le d(\hat\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s})$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} d^2(\hat\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}) + d^2(\gamma_0,\hat\gamma_{t+s}) &= d^2(\hat\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}) + d^2(\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}) + d^2(\gamma_{t+s},\hat\gamma_{t+s}) + 2d(\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s})d(\gamma_{t+s},\hat\gamma_{t+s}) \\ &< d^2(\hat\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}) + d^2(\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}) + d^2(\gamma_{t+s},\hat\gamma_{t+s}) + 2d(\hat\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s})d(\gamma_{t+s},\hat\gamma_{t+s}) \\ &= \big(d(\hat\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}) + d(\gamma_{t+s},\hat\gamma_{t+s})\big)^2 + d^2(\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}) \\ &= d^2(\hat\gamma_0,\hat\gamma_{t+s}) + d^2(\gamma_0,\gamma_{t+s}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from $\hat\gamma_t = \gamma_{t+s}$. Since $\hat\gamma,\gamma \in G$, this is in contradiction with d^2-cyclical monotonicity. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Fix $t \in (0,1)$. Then for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}-$a.e. $\gamma \in G$*

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)} \le \frac{1+t}{1-t},$$

for any sequence $\{\gamma^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset G$ with $\varphi(\gamma_0) > \varphi(\gamma_0^k)$ and $\Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+}) = \Phi_t(\gamma_t^k)$, where $\{s_k^+\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is any null-sequence of positive numbers so that $t+s_k^+ \in I_t(\gamma)$, and

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t-s_k^-})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)} \le \frac{1+t}{1-t},$$

for any sequence $\{\gamma^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset G$ with $\varphi(\gamma_0) > \varphi(\gamma_0^k)$ and $\Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^-}) = \Phi_t(\gamma_t^k)$, where $\{s_k^-\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is any null-sequence of positive numbers so that $t+s_k^- \in I_t(\gamma)$.

Proof. Let us start with the case $\varphi(\gamma_0) > \varphi(\gamma_0^k)$. For $\gamma \in G$ satisfying Assumption 2 the following holds.

From the hypothesis we have

$$\varphi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+}) + \frac{t}{2}L_t^2(\gamma_{t+s_k^+}) = \Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+}) = \varphi(\gamma_0^k) = \Phi_t(\gamma_t^k) = \varphi_t(\gamma_t^k) + \frac{t}{2}L^2(\gamma^k).$$

Hence using Proposition 3.1

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varphi_t(\gamma_t) - \varphi_t(\gamma_t^k)}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)} &= \frac{\varphi_t(\gamma_t) - \varphi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}\frac{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)} + \frac{t}{2}\frac{L_t^2(\gamma_t^k) - L_t^2(\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)} \\ &\ge \frac{\varphi_t(\gamma_t) - \varphi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}\frac{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)} - \frac{t}{2}(L(\gamma^k) + L_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+}))\frac{d(\gamma_t^k,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)} \\ &\ge \frac{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)}\left\{\frac{\varphi_t(\gamma_t) - \varphi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})} - \frac{t}{2}(L(\gamma^k) + L_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+}))\right\} \\ &\quad - \frac{t}{2}(L(\gamma^k) + L_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+}))\,, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the triangle inequality in the last step. From Assumption 1,

$$\frac{\varphi_t(\gamma_t) - \varphi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})} \to L(\gamma) \qquad \text{in } L^2(X,(e_t)_\sharp\boldsymbol{\gamma}),$$

hence for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}-$a.e. γ there is a subsequence $\{s_{k_n}^+\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that the previous ratio converges pointwise to $L(\gamma)$. Then taking the limsup it follows that

$$L(\gamma) \ge \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_{k_n}^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^{k_n})}L(\gamma)(1-t) - tL(\gamma)\,,$$

which directly implies the claim along the subsequence $\{s_{k_n}^+\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Since the upper bound is independent of the chosen subsequence, the claim holds along the whole sequence $\{s_k^+\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

For the case $\varphi(\gamma_0) < \varphi(\gamma_0^k)$ we have to estimate

$$\frac{\varphi_t(\gamma_t^k) - \varphi_t(\gamma_t)}{d(\gamma_t, \gamma_t^k)}\,.$$

Using

$$\varphi_t(\gamma_{t-s_k^-}) + \frac{t}{2}L_t^2(\gamma_{t-s_k^-}) = \Phi_t(\gamma_{t-s_k^-}) = \varphi(\gamma_0^k) = \Phi_t(\gamma_t^k) = \varphi_t(\gamma_t^k) + \frac{t}{2}L^2(\gamma^k)\,,$$

the proof is completely the same as in the first case, proving the claim. □

We are now ready to prove the main result of this note.

Theorem 4.4. *Let Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 hold true and fix $t \in (0,1)$. Then the length map $L_t : e_t(G) \to \mathbb{R}$ has local Lipschitz constant bounded by $C/(t(1-t)^2)$, that is for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$-a.e. $\gamma \in G$*

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{|L(\gamma^k) - L(\gamma)|}{d(\gamma_t^k, \gamma_t)} \leq C\frac{1+t}{t(1-t)^2}$$

where C depends only on the length $L(\gamma)$ and it is uniform in G if $L(\gamma)$ is uniformly bounded.

Proof. Fix $t \in (0,1)$ and $\gamma \in G$ satisfying Assumption 2. Let $\{\gamma^k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset G$ be converging to γ as $k \nearrow \infty$.

Step 1. Assume $\varphi(\gamma_0) > \varphi(\gamma_0^k)$. The function $s \mapsto \Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s})$ is defined just for $t+s \in I_t(\gamma)$. Since φ_t is Lipschitz, from Proposition 3.4, $I_t(\gamma) \ni t+s \mapsto \Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s})$ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant bounded by $C/(1-t)$.

Denote by $\hat\Phi_t$ the Lipschitz extension of Φ_t to an interval, say $I(\gamma)$ containing $I_t(\gamma)$. Since $\Phi_t(\gamma_t) > \Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s})$, the extension $\hat\Phi_t$ can be taken strictly smaller than $\Phi_t(\gamma_t)$ as well.

Step 2. By continuity of $\hat\Phi_t$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large there exists $s_k > 0$ such that

$$\Phi_t(\gamma_t^k) = \hat\Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k}).$$

Then it holds:

$$|\Phi_t(\gamma_t^k) - \Phi_t(\gamma_t)| = |\hat\Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k}) - \Phi_t(\gamma_t)| = |\hat\Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k}) - \hat\Phi_t(\gamma_t)| \leq \frac{C}{1-t}d(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t+s_k}).$$

For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the closest points to $t+s_k$ in $I_t(\gamma)$ from the left:

$$s_k^+ :=\ \max\{s : t+s \in I_t(\gamma), t+s \leq t+s_k\}.$$

Since $I_t(\gamma)$ is a compact set, s_k^+ is well defined and $t+s_k^+ \in I_t(\gamma)$. Since t has density 1 in $I_t(\gamma)$, it follows that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{d(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t+s_k})} = 1,$$

and by construction $s_k^+ \leq s_k$: For every ε_k converging to zero, by Assumption 2

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k}\mathcal{L}^1\Big(I_t(\gamma) \cap [t, t+\varepsilon_k]\Big) = 1.$$

Since $\mathcal{L}^1\Big(I_t(\gamma) \cap [t, t+s_k]\Big) \leq s_k^+$, taking $\varepsilon_k = s_k$

$$1 \leq \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{s_k^+}{s_k} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{d(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t+s_k})} \leq 1.$$

Consequently $d(\gamma_{t+s_k^+}, \gamma_{t+s_k})/d(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t+s_k^+}) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

Step 3. Put $\Phi_t(\gamma_{t+s_k^+}) =: \alpha_k$. Lemma 4.3 implies that if

$$\beta_k := \min\{d(\gamma_t, z) : \Phi_t(z) = \alpha_k\},$$

then

$$\limsup_{k\nearrow\infty} \frac{d(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{\beta_k} \leq \frac{1+t}{1-t}.$$

Moreover since Φ_t is continuous,

$$\limsup_{k\nearrow\infty} \frac{\beta_k}{d(\gamma_t, \gamma_t^k)} \leq 1.$$

Than we can conclude as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|\Phi_t(\gamma_t^k)-\Phi_t(\gamma_t)|}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)} \leq\ & \frac{2C}{1-t}\bigg(\frac{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)}+\frac{d(\gamma_{t+s_k^+},\gamma_{t+s_k})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)}\bigg)\\ =&\frac{2C}{1-t}\bigg(\frac{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)}+\frac{d(\gamma_{t+s_k^+},\gamma_{t+s_k})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}\frac{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_{t+s_k^+})}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)}\bigg)\end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limsup as $k\nearrow\infty$, we have

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}\frac{|\Phi_t(\gamma_t^k)-\Phi_t(\gamma_t)|}{d(\gamma_t,\gamma_t^k)}\leq\frac{2C(1+t)}{(1-t)^2}.$$

The case $\varphi(\gamma_0^k)<\varphi(\gamma_0)$ works the same.

Since $\Phi_t(\gamma_t)=\varphi_t(\gamma_t)+L_t^2(\gamma_t)t/2$, it is then fairly easy to obtain the estimate on L_t with the additional $1/t$ factor and with a different C that however can be taken uniform in γ, provided $L(\gamma)$ is uniformly bounded. ☐

Remark 4.5. If $e_t(G)$ happens to be a length space and quasiconvex, that is for all $x,y\in e_t(G)$ there is a path in $e_t(G)$ joining x to y of length at most $Cd(x,y)$ for some uniform constant C, then the length map L_t is a Lipschitz map. Note that quasiconvexity holds for doubling metric measure spaces supporting a Poincaré inequality.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Ambrosio and N. Gigli. A user's guide to optimal transport. preprint, 2011.

[2] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Calculus and heat flow in metric measure spaces and application to spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below. Preprint, arXiv:1106.2090.

[3] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below. Preprint, arXiv:1109.0222.

[4] F. Cavalletti. Decomposition of geodesics in the Wasserstein space and the globalization property. arXiv preprint arXiv:1209.5909, 2012.

[5] F. Cavalletti and M. Huesmann. Existence of transport maps for strictly convex cost functions. Preprint to appear, 2012.

[6] G. De Philippis and A. Figalli. $W^{2,1}$ regularity for solutions of the Monge–Ampère equation. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, pages 1–15, 2011.

[7] S.-I. Ohta. On the measure contraction property of metric measure spaces. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 82:805–828, 2007.

[8] K.T. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces.I. *Acta Math.*, 196(1):65–131, 2006.

[9] K.T. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces.II. *Acta Math.*, 196(1):133–177, 2006.

[10] C. Villani. *Optimal transport, old and new.* Springer, 2008.

RWTH, Department of Mathematics, Templergraben 64, D-52062 Aachen (Germany)
E-mail address: `cavalletti@instmath.rwth-aachen.de`

Universität Bonn, Institut für angewandte Mathematik, Endenicher Allee 60, D-53115 Bonn (Germany)
E-mail address: `huesmann@iam.uni-bonn.de`